



2010

·
) () ()
·(
·

هـ

	:
1	1.1
2	2.1
3	3.1
4	4.1
	:
5	1.2
21	2.2
21	1.2.2
25	2.2.2
	:
30	1.3
30	2.3
30	3.3
35	4.3
36	5.3
36	6.3
37	7.3

	:
38	1.4
48	2.4
52	3.4
54	
58	

7	(2009-2006)	1
31		2
31		3
32		4
33		5
33		6
34		7
34		8
37	()	9
38		10
39		11
40		12
41		13
41	(One Way ANOVA)	14
42		15
43		16
43	(One Way ANOVA)	17
44	(T.test)	18
45		19

45	(One Way ANOVA)	20
46		21
46	(One Way ANOVA)	22
47	.	(T.test) 23
47		24
48	(One Way ANOVA)	25

58

63

2010

$$\begin{aligned} & \vdots \\ & \vdots \end{aligned} \quad (394)$$

Abstract

The implications of amendments to regulations on traffic accidents from the viewpoint of working in traffic, drivers, a field study on the Hail region, Saudia Arabia Muqrin Saud AlReshidi Mu'tah University 2010

The purpose of this study was to identify the amendments to the traffic system in Saudia Arabia and its impact on traffic accidents. To achieve the objectives of the study a questionnaire has been built and distributed on a sample of (394) participants, the study found the following results:

1. The most common causes of traffic accidents in Saudi Arabia are: excessive speed and abuses in the curves, crossing the red sign and the encroachment from right side, starting once the closing of opposite sign without waiting, the narrow roads and twists, wild Camels, the acceleration of a sudden to cross the sign before closed, racing with another car.
2. More frequent traffic violations: excessive speed, crossing the traffic sign, danger driving in the public streets, non-showing of driver license, driver non-commitment of path, not to put safety belt, cargo redundant, non-showing of car license.
3. The amendments to the traffic system currently in place have worked to reduce traffic accidents.
4. There are differences in the perceptions of respondents about the traffic system changes depending on variables (age, profession).
5. There were no differences in the perceptions of respondents about the traffic system changes depending on variables (educational level, marital status, place of residence, nationality, years of experience).

The study concluded a number of recommendations including: to take deterrent measures against the perpetrators of traffic violations, and to address the problem of wild Camels, civilians' cooperation with traffic police.

: 1.1

.

.

1391/11/6 49/

.

: 2.1

.

.

)

.(1998

.(1998)

.

:

-1

-2

-3

-4

-5

-6

-7

-8

-9

-10

.

.

:

3.1

.

.

: **4.1**

:

.

-1

-2

.

-3

-4

.

.

1.2

.1428

(49 /)

1391/11/6

:

85/

)

.(1428/10/26

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

.6

.7

.8

(49 /)

:1428

1391/11/6

() .1
()

.(24 23 22)

10 .2

6

.
(204 203 202 201 200 199) .3

.
.4

.
.5

.
.6

:

.

.

. 25

.(2009-2006)

(1)

.*(2009-2006)

189	1259	5274	2006
236	1009	5884	2007
213	1074	5714	2008
249	970	6069	2009

*

.2009-2006

(2009-2006)

.

:

:

.(.)

.

()

.(1986)

.(1992)

.(2003)

.(1987)

1429/7/3

1428/10/26

85/

:

.1

.

.

.2

.

.

:

.(2003) :

:

:

.

.

.

.

.

:() :

:

:

.

:

.

:

.

:

:

:

.

.

.

.

.(2003)

.(1998)

:

:

.(1998) :
)

.1

.(

.	.2
.	.3
.	
.	.4
.	.5
.	
.	.6
.	
.	.7
.	
.	.8
.	.9
	⋮
	⋮

.(1998)

⋮

.(2003) :

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

.6

()

.(1990)

: :

.(2003)

)

.(1990

:

:

.(2003)

.(1990)

(1997) :

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

·
:
-

·

·

.(1998)

.(Golias, 1993)

:
-

.(1998)

) :

(1997

.1

.2

.3

.4

- :

(Al-Ashiekh, 1996) .

(1994)

:

:

:

:

.(2003) .

..

.

.(1998) .

:

:

.(2003) .

⋮ ⋮

.

.(2003)

⋮ ⋮

.

.(Golias, 1992 2003)

⋮

.

⋮ -

() .()

.

.(1990)

: -

.

.

.

.

.(1984)

: -

.(1987)

: -

)

.(1990

.

(1987)

(Kerr, 1957) .

)

.(

)

(

.1

.() .2

)
(1993) (

: 2.2

:

. 1.2.2
:

(1984)

.

2018

115

38

17

:

.

,

,

,

.

,

.

: (1992)

: .

%79

.

: (1996)

(1416-1394)

. (1427-1418)

:

.

.

.

: (1997)

.

: (1997)

.
 (%81)
 (21)
 .(%7,4)
 : (1997)

. (450)
 :
 -
 .
 -
 .
 -

.
 .
 : (1997)
 1000
 .
 :

·
(2000)

·
214

(%49)

(%45.94)

· (%50.04)

·
(%86.7)

·
:
(2004)

:

%49

%10.5

.
(2009)

85

.
Spss

)

)

(

.

.

.2.2.2

(Mackenna & Horswill, 2006)

(Sanchez & Angeles, 2005)

:

(Laapotti & Keskinen, 1998)

1991-1987

21-18

75

338

:

(Gregersen, 1996)

53

24-18

:

:(Mathews, 1991)

73

:

(Mathews & Moran, 1986)

23

23

25-18

50-35

.

-

-

.

:

:

.

.

1.3

2.3

3.3

(400)

()

%98.5

394

.(SPSS)

(1)

.

250	250
144	150
394	400

:

(2)

%		%	
18.8	27	32.4	81
63.2	91	29.2	73
16.0	23	24.8	62
2.1	3	13.6	34
100	144	100	250

25-18

%32.4

%29.2

%24.8

%13.6

35-26

25 -18

45-36

25 -18
35-26

45-36

45

%63.2

%18.8

45

%16

%2.1

(4)

%		%	
72.9	105	38.8	97
13.2	19	16.8	42
11.8	17	34.0	85
2.1	3	10.4	26
100	144	100	250

%38.8

%16.8

%34.0

%.10.4

%72.9

%11.8

%13.2

%.2.1

(5)

%		%	
19.4	28	35.6	89
79.9	115	58.8	147
-	-	4.8	12
0.7	1	0.8	2
100	144	100	250

%58.8

%4.8

%35.6

%0.8

%79.9

%0.7

%19.4

(7)

%		%	
74.3	107	53.6	134
13.9	20	21.2	53
11.8	17	25.2	63
100	144	100	250

%53.6

%25.2

%21.2

%74.3

%11.8

%13.9

(8)

%		%	
100	144	86.0	215
-	-	14.0	35
100	144	100	250

%86.0

%14.0

(9)

%		%		
18.1	26	31.2	78	5
36.8	53	24.8	62	10-5
45.1	65	44.0	110	11
100	144	100	250	

(2.49) (3.49-2.5) (3.5)

(3.5)

(3.49-2.5)

(2.49)

:

5.3

:

6.3

(Cronbach's Alpha)

(0.885 0.836 0.917)

:

(10)	
()	
0.917	
0.836	
0.885	
:	7.3
:(SPSS. V.15)	
(Descriptive statistic Measures)	-1
.	
(One Way ANOVA)	-2
:)
.	(
(T.test)	-3
.(:
)

1.4

:

(11)

0.70602	4.6294		1
1.01972	4.3782		9
2.71802	4.3173		7
0.89764	4.2995		2
0.93843	4.2411		28
0.94417	4.2234		6
1.03775	4.2183		8
1.01679	4.1091		5
1.07852	4.0990		10
1.05115	4.0838	()	3
1.07035	4.0838		4
1.05492	3.9594		26
1.19166	3.9518		12
1.13325	3.9086		11
1.15095	3.8629		27
1.20476	3.6751		25
1.31068	3.6168		18
1.30226	3.5076		15
1.33126	3.5000		17
1.35347	3.4619		24
1.27938	3.4442		13
1.33385	3.4086		19
1.34849	3.4010		16
1.39449	3.3959		14
1.38029	3.3426		20
1.64289	3.3426		21
1.32069	3.2690		22
1.33220	3.2690		23
0.68120	3.8214		-

3.821

:

()

:

(12)

0.86846	4.5152	2
1.10477	4.3503	6
1.05150	4.2335	15
1.18641	4.0457	14
2.22111	3.9772	4
1.23549	3.9112	1
1.20552	3.9010	11
1.22501	3.7970	13
1.19128	3.7183	3
1.16318	3.7183	12
1.35181	3.7157	5
1.27756	3.7081	7
1.21566	3.5660	8
1.21020	3.4518	9
1.37955	3.1015	10
0.68910	3.8474	-

3.847

:

.

:

(13)

1.37366	3.5863	1
1.63676	3.7234	2
1.36000	3.6193	3
1.17979	3.7107	4
1.27079	3.7005	5
1.18457	3.8528	6
1.12530	4.0584	7
1.13653	3.9695	8
1.10335	4.0381	9
1.03494	4.1675	10
1.21414	3.8071	11
1.33298	3.4772	12
0.83165	3.8092	-

3.809

:

(14)

0.77383	3.7855	25 -18
0.91969	3.6860	35-26
0.74633	3.9892	45-36
0.67219	4.0113	45

:

(15)

(One Way ANOVA)

F				
		2.272	3	6.816
0.019	*3.344	0.679	390	264.997
			393	271.813

.(0.05 ≥ α) *

(0.019 = α)

3.344

.(0.05 $\geq \alpha$)

:

(16)

45	45-36	35-26	25 -18		
*0.22577	*0.20372	0.09952	-	3.7855	25 -18
*0.32529	*0.30324	-	-	3.6860	35-26
0.02205	-	-	-	3.9892	45-36
-	-	-	-	4.0113	45
.(0.05 $\geq \alpha$)					*

45 45-36) (0.05 $\geq \alpha$)

25-18 (

45 45-36) .(0.22577 0.20372)

35-26 (

.(0.32529 0.30324)

:

.

(17)

.

0.87523	3.7046
0.73822	3.9098
0.83170	3.9224
0.61911	3.9282

:

(18)

(One Way ANOVA)

.

F				
0.086	2.210	1.515	3	4.544
		0.685	390	267.268
			393	271.813

(0.086 = α)

2.210

.(0.05 $\geq \alpha$)

:

()

:

(19)

		(T.test)		
T				
0.05	1.966	0.76213	3.8712	250
		0.93428	3.7005	144
.(0.05 ≥ α)				
*				

(0.05 = α)

1.966 ()

.(0.05 ≥ α)

.3.7005

3.8712

:

(20)

.

0.70691	3.8276
0.86127	3.8063
1.03169	3.7500
2.03613	3.5833

:

(21)

(One Way ANOVA)

.

F				
0.952	0.113	0.079	3	0.237
		0.696	390	271.576
			393	271.813

$(0.952 = \alpha)$

0.113

.($0.05 \geq \alpha$)

:

.

(22)

.

0.86098	3.7635
0.78616	3.8813
0.78036	3.8813

:

(23)

(One Way ANOVA)

.

F				
0.392	0.938	0.649	2	1.298
		0.692	391	270.514
			393	271.813

$$(0.392 = \alpha)$$

$$0.938$$

$$.(0.05 \geq \alpha)$$

:

.

(24)

(T.test)

T				
0.122	1.549	82854.	3.7890	359
		84714.	4.0167	35

$$(0.122 = \alpha)$$

$$1.549$$

()

$$.(0.05 \geq \alpha)$$

:

.

(25)

0.76719	3.7877	5
0.84506	3.9036	10-5
0.85863	3.7600	11

:

(26)
(One Way ANOVA)

F				
		0.749	2	1.497
0.340	1.083	0.691	391	270.315
			393	271.813

(0.340 = α)

1.083

.(0.05 $\geq \alpha$)

2.4

:

.1

:

)

(

(1984)

(1996)

(1997)

(1997)

(Mckenn & Horswill, 2006)

(Laapotti & Keskinen, 1998)

.
.2

:

.
.3

(1997)

.
(2000)

(%86.7)

49% (2004)

10.5%

(2009)

.4

(45 45-36)
45 45-36 . 25-18
35-26 (

.5

.6

.7

.8

.9

.10

3.4

.1

.2

.3

.

.4

.

.

.5

.6

.

(1998)

(1997)

(23 -20)

(1997)

(23 -20)

(1997)

(1996)

(2004)

7-4

(1998)

1

(1998)

2

(1992)

3

(1984)

.19-12

(7)

49/

. 1391

85/

1428/10/26

.2009-2006

(2009)

10

.86-59 2

(1984)

(1994)

(2003)

Al-Ashiekh, M. (1996), **Analysis of Traffic Injuries and Fatalities in Riyadh: Epidemiological Study**, College of Eng, King Saud University, Riyadh.

Golias, J.(1993), Aspects of Road Accident Death Analyses, **Journal of Transportation Engineering ASCE**, Vol(118), No(2), 299-311.

Gregersen. N, (1996), young drivers overestimation of their own Skills: An experiment on the relation Between Training Strategy and Skills, **Accident Analysis and prevention**. Vol (4), No(7), PP 73-85.

Kerr, W., (1957), Complementary Theories of Safety Psychology, **Journal of Social Psychology**, 45(3), pp 3-11.

- Laapotti, S & Keskinen, E, (1998), Differences in fatal loss of control accident Between Young Male and Female Drivers, **analysis and prevention**. Vol(1), No(3), PP 31-65.
- Makenna, F, & Horswill, M, (2006), Risk Taking From The Participant's Perspective: The Driving and Accident Risk, **Health Psychology** , 25(2), pp 163-170.
- Mathews, (1991), Personality Correlated of Driver Stress, Personality and Individual Differences, **Journal of Modern optics**, 53(99), PP 1343-1362.
- Mathews, M & Moran, A, (1986), Age Difference in Male Drivers Perception of Accident Risk: The Role of Perceived Driving Ability, Special Issue: Youth and Traffic Accident, **Risk Accident Analysis & Prevention**.
- Sanchez, M & Angels, Q, (2005), Prevention of Traffic Accident: The Assessment of Perceptual –Motor Alterations Befor Obtaining Driving License, Alongitudinal Study of The First Years of Driving, **Brain Injury**, 19(3), pp 189-196.

()

.....

.

:

.

.

.....

/

/

:

(x)

:

35-26 <input type="checkbox"/>	25 -18 <input type="checkbox"/>	-1
45 <input type="checkbox"/>	45-36 <input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-2
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	() <input type="checkbox"/>	-3
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-4
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-5
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	-6
10 – 5 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	-7
<input type="checkbox"/>	11 <input type="checkbox"/>	

(x)

:

:

						1
						2
					()	3
						4
						5
						6
						7
						8
						9
						10
						11
						12
						13
						14
						15
						16
						17
						18
						19
						20
						21
						22
						23
						24
						25
						26
						27
						28
.....	29

:

(x)

						1
						2
						3
						4
						5
						6
						7
						8
						9
						10
						11
						12
						13
						14
						15
.....		16
.....		
.....		
.....		
.....		

(x)

.

:

					.	1
						2
						3
						4
						5
						6
						7
						8
						9
						10
						11
						12

()